

## IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

JANUARY 2, 1821.

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the petition and appeal of Joseph Wheaton,

## REPORT:

That the petitioner charges the United States with the sum of \$19,900 89, for his services during the late war in four staff offices; first, as acting assistant commissary general of ordnance; second, as deputy quartermaster general; third, as commissary, in purchasing and issuing provisions to militia; and, fourth, as physician, superintendent, and manager, of the hospital and medical establishment at Richmond; when he never was appointed to any but a situation in the quartermaster department, the duties of which would have occupied the whole of his time if they had been properly attended to; that he has been paid for his services as assistant deputy quartermaster from the date of his appointment to the time of his nomination as deputy quartermaster; and has also been paid for his services in that capacity up to the close of the session of Congress in 1815, although his nomination was rejected by the Senate on the 30th of January of that year; and that he has been further paid, as assistant deputy quartermaster, from the close of the session of Congress in 1815 to the 31st May, 1816, although his actual duties had closed before that time.

The regulations of the War Department, during the late war, *wisely* prohibited any officer from holding two staff appointments at the same time; and this is the first instance, within the knowledge of the committee, where an officer has *assumed* three distinct offices in the face of said regulation, and exhibited his accounts with all the paraphernalia of horses, servants, &c. &c. The accounts of the petitioner, for the three *assumed* offices, amounting to \$16,108 06, were never presented for settlement, nor heard of by the accounting officer, until subsequent to the passage of the law for his relief, on the 3d March, 1819. That, on examining the allowances made under said act, the committee are of opinion that the utmost liberality has been extended to the petitioner by the accounting officers, and a variety of items allowed him on his own oath, (as is the practice in settling accounts under such acts, in the absence of proper vouchers;) among others, the committee will refer to the two following, to wit:

one of \$454 58, allowed on his own representation that he 'actually paid the money, and that he could not account why his clerk forwarded copies instead of original vouchers; another item, for supplies of provisions; when his accounts were first rendered, he charged \$1,505, and afterwards was allowed, under the *law passed for his relief*, \$2,805, for the *same supplies*, on his own oath that the provisions cost him that sum. That the delay in the settlement of his accounts arose from the confused manner in which they were kept and rendered, and not from the fault of the accounting officers, as alleged by him. The committee are of opinion that he has already received more money from the government than he was entitled to, and submit the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the prayer of the petition ought to be rejected.